DATE: NOVEMBER 1, 2018

TIME: 2:00 PM

MEETING ORGANIZER:

Nicole DiStasio

ATTENDEES:

State representatives: Jennifer Perkins; Bard Hill; Jackie Rogers

Provider Representatives: William Ashe; Jennifer Stratton

Recipient Representatives:

Non-Member Public Participants: Beth Masters, Lynn, Cath Burns,

Simone Rueschemeyer

MATERIALS:

Vermont's Needs Assessment Tool (required); Colorado Assessment

Tools Comparison (suggested), slide deck

MEETING MINUTES

Scope of Work: Explore alternative standardized assessment tools

A Needs Assessment Tool should be:

- Valid, reliable, and consistent
- Person-centered
- Able to guide and inform our processes
- Reasonable to implement

The group reviews the parameters for an assessment tool.

Defining:

- *Reliable*: means the same thing, every time.
- *Valid*: means that is measures what it is supposed to be measuring.
- Reasonable: includes the cost, but also considers things beyond financial, such
 as duration of the process, culture change, credential level of assessors, how to
 transition, training needs to transition, and availability of assessors.





- What is the role of the tool?
- What is the policy?
- How is the documentation stored and accessed?
- How is the data being used?
- What are the training methods?
- How does it handle exceptional needs?
- What does it measure?
- How does it inform funding priorities?

Role: What are we using the information for?

- Developing ISAs
- Component of funding context
- Can support ISB
- Intake
- To identify support levels in an individual area (what is

currently in place, what are the consequences of those things in place)

- To justify movement of funds (or increase, decrease, changes)
- Change in need
- Annual (?)

Policy: is there clear policy regarding the use of the tool, and if so where is it?

- No policy that limits the lifetime of the assessment
- No tracking of when it is done and or when a new assessment is due

Stored: Where is it stored? And how is it accessed?

- Will be included in the implementation of the new EHR
- For some agencies a document (pdf) or a scanned image
- Not mineable
- Not designed and/or being utilized for any analytics

Usage: How is the data being used?

- Measures changes in the context. A person may remain the same, but the environment changes.
- SIS explicitly excludes the natural supports
- Person centered goals and desires is more in the ISA
- Blends the services and supports
- Used inconsistently
- Used as an attempt to establish a cost range: the same needs in an individual could have wildly different costs dependent on the package of services, the location, etc. The range gives the providers the flexibility.

Training: how are people trained to use the tool?

- Varies by agency: could use some standardization and structure
- Adopted by the State as a tool

• Question: have any agencies made modifications to the tool?

Measure: What does it measure?

- Current services and natural supports
- Does not do current services and natural supports, but we ask those
- Informal and formal services
- Significant changes
- Includes expected or consistent changes (such as in school or out for summer) and would factor that into the yearly budget
- Would capture other (clinical) supports
- The tool is incorrectly being used to assess eligibility

Follow Up: Jennifer will check to see if she can get the Oregon supplemental questions, but she thinks they might be proprietary.

OUR NEXT MEETING'S DATE: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15TH 2-330PM